REPORT RESUMES

ED 003 679 24

CHEATING AS RELATED TO THE SOCIAL SYSTEM IN A UNIVERSITY.

BY- LEWIS, DAVID M.

WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIV., KALAMAZOO

REPORT NUMBER CRP-S-072 PUB DATE 65

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.18 HC-$4.36 109P.

DESCRIPTORS- *CHEATING, CONDUCT, BEHAVIOR, *COLLEGE STUDENTS, *PERCEPTION, PERCEPTION TESTS, *COLLEGE FACULTY, *TESTING, TEST CONSTRUCTION, SOCIAL RELATIONS, QUESTIONNAIRES, KALAMAZOO, MICHIGAN

AN INSTRUMENT WAS DEVELOPED WHICH COULD BE USED TO INVESTIGATE UNIVERSITY STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF SITUATIONS WHICH CONSTITUTE CHEATING. ALSO AN INSTRUMENT WAS DEVELOPED TO INVESTIGATE STUDENTS' PERCEPTION OF THE WILLINGNESS OF FACULTY MEMBERS TO RELATE TO THEM IN A VARIETY OF WAYS AND SITUATIONS. THE PERCEPTION OF TEACHERS AS UNWILLING TO RELATE TO THE STUDENT WAS INTERPRETED AS SOCIAL ISOLATION. SCALOGRAM ANALYSIS (GUTTMAN SCALING) WAS USED TO EVALUATE RESPONSES AND TO DETERMINE WHETHER THE ITEMS USED IN QUESTIONNAIRES WERE CORRECTLY PERCEIVED BY THE RESPONDENTS. EVIDENCE FROM THE STUDY INDICATED THAT THERE WERE STABLE PERCEPTIONS OF THE RELATIVE DEGREE TO WHICH VARIOUS BEHAVIORS CONSTITUTE CHEATING. THE PERCEPTIONS WERE RELATED TO THE SEX OF THE STUDENT AND PERCEPTIONS OF WILLINGNESS OF TEACHERS TO RELATE TO THEM. A HIGH PERCENTAGE OF THOSE MALE STUDENTS WHO ARE SOCIALLY ISOLATED FROM FACULTY MEMBERS CONSIDER MORE SITUATIONS AS NOT CHEATING THAN THOSE STUDENTS NOT ISOLATED FROM THE FACULTY. (JC)

CHEATING AS RELATED TO THE SOCIAL SYSTEM IN A UNIVERSITY

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Office of Education
This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

Cooperative Research Project No. S-072

David M. Lewis, Ph.D.

Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, Michigan

1965

The research reported herein was supported by the Cooperative Research Program of the Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

ED 003679

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer is indebted to a number of persons for help on this project. They include the many students who provided the data for the project, and the persons who contributed to the analysis of these data and preparation of the final report. Particular thanks are due; Dr. Helenan S. Lewis and Dr. Jerome G. Manis of the Western Michigan University Center for Sociological Research for guidance in the analysis of data, Mr. Stephen M. Vargo for exercising meticulous care in the preparation of data, Dr. Jack R. Meagher of the Western Michigan University Computer Center for expediting the analysis of these data, and Mrs. Rosalie Roberts for careful preparation of manuscripts and final reports.

1965 David M. Lewis

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

I. Statement of the Problem 1

II. Objectives 4
  Instrument Development 4
  Exploratory Analysis 4

III. Theoretical Framework Incorporating Previous Research and Statement of Hypotheses 5

  Statement of Hypotheses 8
  Sex and Class in the University 10
    Effects of Sex 10
    Effects of Class in the University 11

IV. Procedure 12
  Administration of Questionnaires and Numbers of Respondents 12
  Scalogram Analysis 15
    Coefficient of Reproducibility 17
    Coefficient of Scalability 17
    Minimal Marginal Reproducibility 18
    The Use of Statistical Tests 18

V. Development of Scales and Tests of Hypotheses 20
  The Perception of Cheating Scale 20
  Scale Analysis 30
    Unidimensionality 30
  Social Isolation 38
    Srole's Scale of Anomia 39
    Revision of Srole's Scale of Anomia 41
    Social Isolation and Perception of Cheating 49
    Social Isolation and Cheating Scale Scores 50
    Responses to the Two Social Isolation Items Selected From the Revised Srole's Scale as Related to Cheating Scale Scores 51

  Elaboration of the Analysis of the Relationship Between Isolation From Teachers and Perceptions of Cheating 56

    Sex and Class in the University 56
  Development of an Isolation From Teachers Scale 70
  Analysis of the Effect of Isolation From Teachers Upon Perception of Cheating, Using the Teacher Isolation Scale and the Cheating Scale 75
    Reported Contact With Teachers and Perception of Cheating 78

Comparison of Student and Faculty Perceptions of Cheating 79
Perceptions of Cheating and Self-Report of Cheating Behavior 82

VI. Conclusions and Implications 85

Summary 91

Appendix A - Questionnaire

Bibliography

List of Tables

Tables **Page**

1. Rank Order of Items Based on the Percent of Respondents Who Consider Them as Describing Situations Which Constitute Cheating. 23
2. Rank Order of Items Based on the Percent of Total Respondents Who Consider the Situation Described by the Item to be Cheating. 26
3. Comparisons of Rank Orderings of Items Ranked on the Basis of the Percent of Various Categories of Respondents Who Consider Them as Descriptive of Situations Constituting Cheating. 29
4. Items Used for Scalogram Analysis (1962 data). 31
5. Scale Characteristics (1962 data). 31
6. Percent of Respondents in Each of Three Selected Sets of Students Who Consider Behaviors Described by Questionnaire Items as Cheating or Not Cheating. 34
7. Percent of All Students Who Consider Selected Behaviors as Cheating or Not Cheating. 35
8. Ranking of Scale Items Based Upon the Proportion of Students in Each of Three Selected Sets of Students Who Consider the Behavior Described by the Items as Not Cheating. 36
9. Results of Scale Analyses of Students' Responses to Five Items Describing Behavior Which They Designated as Cheating or Not Cheating. 37
10. Percent of Respondents Giving Agree Responses to Each of the Items Comprising Sroles' Scale of Anomia. 40
11. Percent of Respondents Giving Agree Responses to Each of the Items Comprising the Revised Version of Sroles' Scale of Anomia. 45
12. Rank of Students in Class Categories of Freshman Through Senior Based Upon the Percent Responding "Agree" to Each of the Five Items Comprising the Revised Version of the Sroles' Scale of Anomia. 46
13. Percent of Male and Female Respondents Giving Agree Responses to Each of the Items Comprising the Revised Version of the Sroles' Scale of Anomia. 47

Tables **Page**

14. Chi-Square Analysis of Responses to Items Comprising the Revised Version of the Srole Scale of Anomia When Respondents are Categorized by Class in the University. 48

15. Chi-Square Analysis of Responses to Items Comprising the Revised Version of the Srole Scale of Anomia When Respondents are Categorized by Sex. 48

16. Mean Number of Total Items Designated as Not Cheating by Students Who Agree or Disagree With the Two Social Isolation Items Selected From the Revised Sroles' Scale in 1963. 49

17. Mean Cheating Scale Scores for Students Giving Isolated and Non-Isolated Responses to the Two Social Isolation Items From the Revised Sroles' Scale in 1963. 52

18. Mean Cheating Scale Scores for Students Giving Isolated and Non-Isolated Responses to the Two Social Isolation Items From the Revised Sroles' Scale in 1964. 53

19. Comparison of Mean Cheating Scale Scores of Isolates and Non-Isolates, Controlling for Each Type of Isolation Separately. 55

20. Responses of Male and Female Students Surveyed in 1964 to the Teacher Isolation Item from the Revised Sroles' Scale. 58

21. Ranking of Male and Female Isolated Respondents According to Class in the University, Controlling for the Effects of Sex. 59

22. Percent of Male and Female Students Surveyed in 1962 Who Give a "Not Cheating" Response to Each Item in the Cheating Questionnaire. 61

23. Percent of Male and Female Students Surveyed in 1963 Who Give a "Not Cheating" Response to Each Item in the Cheating Questionnaire. 63

24. Percent of Male and Female Students Surveyed in 1964 Who Give a "Not Cheating" Response to Each Item in the Cheating Questionnaire. 64

Tables **Page**

25. Percent of Male Students Surveyed in 1963, Categorized by Class in the University, Who Give a "Not Cheating" Response to Each Item in the Cheating Questionnaire. 66

26. Percent of Female Students Surveyed in 1963, Categorized by Class in the University, Who Give a "Not Cheating" Response to Each Item in the Cheating Questionnaire. 67

27. Percent of Male Students Surveyed in 1964, Categorized by Class in the University, Who Give a "Not Cheating" Response to Each Item in the Cheating Questionnaire. 68

28. Percent of Female Students Surveyed in 1964, Categorized by Class in the University, Who Give a "Not Cheating" Response to Each Item in the Cheating Questionnaire. 69

29. Distribution of Responses of Sophomore, Junior, and Senior Students, Surveyed in 1964, to Each Item of the Teacher Isolation Questionnaire. 72

30. Percent of Males and Females Among Sophomores, Juniors, and Seniors, Surveyed in 1964, Who Give Isolated Responses to Each Item of the Teacher Isolation Questionnaire. 73

31. Mean Cheating Scale Scores of Male and Female Respondents Who Have High and Low Teacher Isolation Scale Scores. 76

32. Mean Cheating Scale Scores of Students With Greater and Lesser Reported Contact With Teachers. 78

33. Comparison of the Percent of "Not Cheating" Responses Given to Each Item in the Cheating Questionnaire by Faculty Members and Students. 80

34. Percent of Students Admitting Committing a Specific Act and Average Percent of Students Defining a Comparable Act as One Which is Not Cheating. 83

I. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Behavior which deviates from the norm of academic honesty, cheating, has long been a problem of central concern to university faculty and administrators. The faculty and administrators of the university from which most of the subjects for this study have been selected, Western Michigan University, consider cheating to be detrimental to the central purpose of the university. This position is formally stated in several university publications. In the handbook of University Policies and the Faculty the formal policy of the university is clearly stated as one of strong opposition to cheating.

UNIVERSITY POLICY ON STUDENT CHEATING
Approved by the Faculty Senate, February 8, 1962

The faculty of Western Michigan University wishes to assert its position that student cheating cannot and will not be tolerated. If it is permitted, the honest student is penalized for his honesty, and the dishonest rewarded for the harm he does to himself and to the rest of the academic community. Most important, cheating clearly subverts the university ideal of independent, original, and individual thinking and learning.

> Definition: Cheating shall be defined as any attempt by a student to represent work performed wholly or in part by others as his own, or any effort to use unauthorized aids during a formal testing situation.
>
> Procedures: A faculty member who detects cheating should handle the discipline himself or turn the case over to the Dean of Men or Dean of Women for reference to established disciplinary bodies. All actions taken on cheating, whether by the faculty member or by one of the disciplinary bodies, should be reported to the Dean of Students. Student representatives should have at least a preliminary voice in the disposition of all cases involving cheating that have been referred to a disciplinary committee and in the establishment of fair and reasonable standards for degrees of punishment, including expulsion.[1]

---

[1] Faculty Senate of Western Michigan University, University Policies and the Faculty, (Kalamazoo, Michigan: Western Michigan University, rev. ed. 1965), pp. 32-33.

This policy is similarly stated in a university publication which is designed primarily for student information, Western Way.

> ### CHEATING
>
> The faculty of Western Michigan wishes to assert its position that student cheating cannot and will not be tolerated. If it is permitted, the honest student is penalized for his honesty and the dishonest student is rewarded for the harm that he does to himself and to the rest of the academic community. Most important, cheating clearly subverts the University ideal of independent, original, and individual thinking and learning.
>
> Definition: Cheating shall be defined as any attempt by a student to represent work performed wholly or in part by others as his own, or any effort to use unauthorized aids during a formal testing situation.[2]

These statements clearly convey to both faculty and students the formal institutional position of condemnation of cheating. In addition, the statements present both faculty and students with the same definition of cheating.

However, this definition allows for, or necessitates, considerable interpretation on the part of both faculty and students. There are undoubtedly a number of behavioral situations, not covered by this definition, which teachers and/or students may consider as constituting cheating. Also, situations falling within the scope of this definition may vary in terms of specific details which will affect a faculty member's, or student's definition of a situation as one which constitutes cheating. This problem of variation in definitions of situations which may be perceived as constituting a violation of the norm of academic honesty is central to the present study.

---

[2] The Student Association of Western Michigan University, 1965 Western Way, (Kalamazoo, Michigan: Western Michigan University, 1965), p. 34.

Decisions of faculty members and students as to whether a situation constitutes cheating will depend upon their definition of cheating. In effect, then, these definitions of the situation of cheating can be viewed as determining the content of the norm of academic honesty by specifying the kinds of behavior which an individual considers a violation of the norm.

This view of the relation between definition of situations and norms is representative of the theoretical position of W. I. Thomas. Thomas described the process of definition of the situation as a stage of examination and deliberation which occurred preliminary to any self-determined act of behavior. Thomas proposed that behavior norms are built up through such definitions of situations. Therefore, if this theoretical perspective is accepted it can be assumed that voluntary control of behavior in accordance with the norm of academic honesty will vary with variation in definitions of cheating. Such variation would pose problems since it would indicate that the norm of academic honesty is not similarly perceived by all students and therefore there will be variation in attempts to limit behavior to boundaries specified by the norm.

II. OBJECTIVES

Instrument Development

One major objective of this study is to develop an instrument which can be used to investigate university students perceptions of the kinds of situations which constitute cheating. A second major objective is to develop an instrument which can be used to investigate students' perceptions of the willingness of faculty members to relate to them in a variety of ways and situations. A perception of teachers as unwilling to relate to the student will be interpreted in terms of the concept of social isolation.

Exploratory Analysis

A secondary objective of this study is to conduct an exploratory examination of factors associated with varying perceptions of cheating and with varying degrees of social isolation. In addition an exploratory analysis of the interrelationship between social isolation and perception of cheating is to be accomplished.

III. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK INCORPORATING PREVIOUS RESEARCH AND STATEMENT OF HYPOTHESES

Theoretical Framework

A generally accepted postulate in social science is the principle that men respond to stimuli in a selective manner and that the process of selection is influenced by the manner in which they define or interpret situations. Pre-existing definitions are likely to affect social behavior, and interaction within social situations influences the development and modification of such definitions.[3]

This process of definition of the situation was described by W. I. Thomas as a stage of examination and deliberation which occurred preliminary to any self-determined act of behavior. He further expressed the view that the child is born into a group of people among whom the general types of situations which may arise have already been defined. These generally accepted, pre-existing, definitions of situations are viewed as forming the basis for the moral norms governing behavior in such situations.[4]

Sociological analysis of definition of situations is concerned with the examination of shared definitions of situations which make social living possible.[5] If, as Thomas proposed, behavior norms are built up through definitions of situations, then an examination of the extent to which such definitions are shared should indicate the degree to which a norm is viewed as appropriate for regulating behavior in a situation.

---

[3] Lewis A. Coser and Bernard Rosenberg, Sociological Theory: A Book of Readings, (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1964) p. 232.

[4] Ibid. pp. 233-234.

[5] Coser and Rosenberg, p. 232.

Of course many of the groups within which human behavior takes place are groups which an individual enters into voluntarily. When such groups carry out their activities within the framework of a particular institution it can be expected that pre-existing shared definitions of situations will have evolved in the course of the members interpretation of recurring situations characteristic of the groups institutionalized activities.

It may be that a norm imposed on a group by an external authority does not have the support of shared values, or does not have the support of shared definitions of situations which universally define the norm as appropriate for governing behavior in each situation.[6] If so, this would seem to constitute a problematic situation for any institution within which normative regulation of behavior is deemed necessary for the accomplishment of institutional goals.

The formal institutional definition of the situation of cheating was presented in the Statement of the Problem.[7] This, though a broad definition, may not encompass some of the situations which may be perceived as cheating. It definitely does not include the various qualifying conditions which might influence a student to perceive a particular situation as one which does not constitute cheating. This means that even though students are familiar with the formal institutional definition of cheating there is considerable leeway for interpretation of this definition. This means then that there may be considerable variation in students' personal definitions of cheating.

---

[6] Jack P. Gibbs. "Norms: The Problem of Definition and Classification," AJS, Vol. 70, no. 5, March 1965, p. 589.

[7] See page 1

It can be assumed from the statement of the faculty position on cheating[8] that faculty members are the immediate institutional representatives who are placed in the position of defining particular student behavioral situations as ones which do or do not constitute cheating. Therefore, a faculty members' definition of cheating is particularly important in terms of regulation of student behavior. Since faculty members view cheating as subverting the ideals and goals of the university it may be assumed[9] that they will include more situations in their definition of cheating than will students. Students can be assumed to be concerned not only with the accomplishment of university goals but also with the accomplishment of immediate personal goals in the form of high grades. This latter personal goal of grades may well lead to an interpretation of the definition of cheating which imposes fewer restrictions upon behavior in the pursuit of grades than does the faculty members' interpretation of this definition.

---

[8] See page 1

[9] However, in the course of the study an exploration of selected faculty member's definitions of cheating will provide a tentative check on the validity of this assumption. A basis for this assumption is found in a 1960 study by Frymier which reported that faculty members generally seem to be more severe in describing a particular behavioral act as cheating than are students. Though the behaviors described in this previous study differ considerably from those investigated in the present study the difference in attitudinal orientation should be similar. J. R. Frymier, "Faculty and Student Perceptions of Cheating," Journal of Educational Research 54 (November 1960), p. 120.

If these assumptions are correct, then to the degree that a student is isolated from faculty members he will define fewer situations as cheating, since he is less likely to be influenced by the faculty's definition of cheating. Conversely, to the extent that a student is isolated from other students he is likely to define more situations as cheating since he will be less influenced by other students' definitions of cheating.

This theoretical statement forms the basis for the hypotheses stated below.

Statement of Hypotheses

Students' Perceptions of Cheating

It is proposed that students develop shared definitions of the situation of cheating. Therefore it is expected that they will exhibit considerable consensus in their designation of various situations as cheating or not cheating. The first two hypothesis are based on this theoretical premise.

Hypothesis I.

For the majority of situations described by questionnaire items students will demonstrate a high degree of consensus in their designation of these situations as cheating.

Hypothesis II.

The relative degree of consensus for the various situations described by questionnaire items will be highly consistent for successive selected sets of students.

Hypothesis III

Students' perceptions of cheating are indicative of a stable unidimensional attitude toward cheating.

Social Isolation and Perception of Cheating

The above theoretical statement relates students' perception of cheating to their relations with faculty members. It is proposed that the closer the relationship, or perceived relationship, the greater the likelihood of acceptance of faculty definitions of the situation of cheating. It is assumed that faculty members tend to define more situations as cheating than do students. This rationale forms the basis for the fourth and fifth hypotheses.

Hypothesis IV

Students who are socially isolated from faculty members will consider more situations as not cheating than those who are not isolated from faculty members.

Hypothesis V

Students who are socially isolated from other students will consider fewer situations as not cheating than those who are not isolated from other students.

Sex and Class in the University

Since differential socialization of males and females in our society has a definite effect upon personality orientations[10] it can be expected that the sex of the student will have an effect upon perceived social isolation from teachers and perceptions of cheating.[11] The students' class in the university (i.e. Freshman, Sophomore, Junior, or Senior) can be expected to be related to both isolation and perceptions of cheating since it is an indicator of the length of time the student has spent within the social system of the university and should in part be indicative of the effects of the social system upon the students' perceptions. On the basis of this rationale Hypothesis VI through XI have been developed.

Effects of Sex

Hypothesis VI

The sex of students is associated with their perceived social isolation from teachers.

---

[10] Carlson and Carlson found in a survey of studies of personality reported in the Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology that for 32 studies for which tests of sex differences were reported 69% of these were found at a level of statistical significance. Earl R. Carlson and Rae Carlson, "Male and Female Subjects In Personality Research," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 61, No. 3, (1960), pp. 482-483.

[11] The nature of this association is suggested by Anderson's 1957 study which reported that females consider more academic behaviors as "unjustified" than do males. Though most of the behaviors described differ considerably from those described for this study, this would lead to the expectation that females would describe more behaviors as "cheating" than would males. W. F. Anderson Jr. "Attitudes of University Students Toward Cheating," Journal of Educational Research, 50 (April 1957), p. 586.

Hypothesis VII

The sex of students is associated with their perceived social isolation from other students.

Hypothesis VIII

The sex of students is associated with their perceptions of cheating.

Effects of Class in the University

Hypothesis IX

Students' class in the university is associated with their perceived isolation from teachers.

Hypothesis X

Students' class in the university is associated with their perceived isolation from other students.

Hypothesis XI

Students' class in the university is associated with their perceptions of cheating.

IV. PROCEDURE

The survey method was used to acquire information from students concerning their perceptions of cheating and their perceptions of faculty members.

Administration of Questionnaires and Numbers of Respondents

All questionnaires were administered to students on the first day of the class in which they were surveyed. In all cases students were asked if they had previously responded to the questionnaire. The questionnaires of the several students who responded in the affirmative were discarded.

The detailed listing of respondents given below is ordered on the basis of the year in which respondents were surveyed. In each case the type of class, number of students surveyed in each period and instruments administered is given.

The numbers of respondents used in the various analyses throughout the study will vary somewhat due to failure of students to respond to one or more items forming the questionnaires. This non-response rate varies from approximately 1% - 5% and is not considered as having any significant effect upon the results of the study. In those cases where the non-response rate is considered to be worth noting it is specified in detail. In any case, since the main objectives of the study are instrument development and exploratory analysis, problems of sampling and response rates are not a primary concern.

The first two sets of respondents used in the initial exploratory phase of the study were surveyed at Michigan State University. The remainder were surveyed at Western Michigan University, a state supported institution located in Kalamazoo, Michigan with a current enrollment of approximately 14,000 students.

Year of Survey	Questionnaire	Classes Surveyed	N
1960	a. 16 Item Cheating Questionnaire with Agree, Undecided, Disagree response alternative	Two sections of Introductory Social Psychology	90
	b. Sroles' Scale of Anomia		
1961	a. Sroles' Scale of Anomia	Three sections of Introductory Sociology	131
1961	a. 16 Item Cheating Questionnaire with a "Yes", "No" response alternative	One Political Science class and one section of Introductory Sociology	84
1962	a. 21 Item Cheating Questionnaire with a "C", "NC" response alternative	Four sections of Principles of Sociology and one section of Industrial Sociology	238
1963	a. 21 Item Cheating Questionnaire with a "C", "NC" response alternative	Three sections of Principles of Sociology	178
	b. 5 Item modified version of Sroles' Scale of Anomia		
1964	a. 21 Item Cheating Questionnaire with a "C", "NC" response alternative	Six sections of Principles of Sociology, two advanced Sociology classes, one Introductory Biological Science class	631
	b. 5 Item modified version of Sroles' Scale of Anomia		
	c. 10 Item Teacher Isolation Questionnaire		
	d. 10 Item Student Isolation Questionnaire		

Scalogram Analysis[12]

Scalogram analysis (Guttman Scaling) is employed in this study for evaluating responses to the cheating questionnaire and the social isolation questionnaire to determine whether the items used in these questionnaires are perceived by respondents as having a similar meaning: If a set of statements contained in the questionnaire meets the basic requirements of a unidimensional scale, it is assumed that the statements fall along a single dimension and that the responses of the subjects to the statements are determined by their position on this dimension.

It is not possible to tell in advance whether the statements used in a questionnaire fall along a single continuum from least to most favorable. The purpose of scalogram analysis is to determine whether, if we start with this as a hypothesis, the responses of the subjects are in accord with the theoretical model of a unidimensional scale of statements, the scores of subjects upon the statements will be interpreted as likewise falling along the same unidimensional continuum.

---

[12] The following sources provide extensive discussions of scalogram analysis: Allen L. Edwards, Techniques of Attitude Scale Construction, (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1957), pp. 172-200; Louis Guttman, "On Festingers Evaluation of Scale Analysis," Psychological Bulletin, 44, No. 5 (September, 1947), pp. 451-65; Matilda W. Riley et. al., Sociological Studies in Scale Analysis, (New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 1954); and Warren S. Torgerson, Theory and Methods of Scaling, (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1958), pp. 307-31.

Procedure for the development and evaluation of Guttman Scales

The procedure followed in the scalogram analysis of responses to the Cheating questionnaire and Social Isolation questionnaire is outlined below.

1. Responses to the Cheating questionnaire items were considered "positive" if the respondent indicated that the situation described by the item was not considered to be cheating. Responses to the Social Isolation questionnaire were considered "positive" if the respondent indicated that he did not consider teachers willing to relate to him in the manner described by the item. These positive responses were given a score of 1, and the opposite response to an item was given a score of 0.
2. These scores were punches on IBM cards, which were sorted to determine the percentage of positive responses to each item.
3. Items falling within the approximate range of 20 to 80 percent positive were utilized for the development of scales.
4. Cards were sorted in order from respondents giving the greatest number of positive responses to those giving the least number of positive responses.
5. Responses were then printed out in this order, the order of items ranging from that with the fewest positive responses to that with the most.
6. Scale types and errors to scale type were assigned in the usual manner employed in scalogram analysis. Respondents were assigned to those scale types which produced a minimum of error, and, where

a respondent could be assigned to two scale types with the same error count in each, the rule of thumb employed was to assign him to the scale type nearest the middle of the scale.

Coefficient of Reproducibility

The principal test of scalability employed in a scalogram analysis is the coefficient of reproducibility. To compute this coefficient the proportion of errors to total responses to all items being scaled is subtracted from unity. This value is intended to indicate the percentage of accuracy with which responses to the various statements can be reproduced from the total scores. The empirical rule as to the acceptance of a set of items as sufficiently scalable has varied from .85 to .90. The latter value is the more commonly accepted one at present.[13]

Coefficient of Scalability

Herbert Menzel[14] has described a procedure which may be used for evaluating the effect of marginals of items upon a coefficient of reproducibility. This procedure results in a value termed the coefficient of scalability. This coefficient varies from 0 to 1, and is a measure of the scalability of the items used. This coefficient makes it possible to speak meaningfully of degrees of scalability, instead of merely deciding whether a set of items does or does not scale. Menzel suggests that the level of acceptance for this coefficient may be between .60 and .65.

---

[13] Louis Guttman, op. cit., p. 455.

[14] Herbert Menzel, "A New Coefficient for Scalogram Analysis," Public Opinion Quarterly, 17 (Summer, 1953), pp. 268-80.

Minimal Marginal Reproducibility

The reproducibility of any single item can never be less than the proportion present in the modal response category. Statements with a high modal frequency--i.e., extreme marginals--must yield a high coefficient of reproducibility.

> The minimum coeficient of reproducibility which it is possible to obtain with a given set of statements having known frequencies in each of the categories of response can easily be determined. Simply find the proportion of responses in the modal category for each statement. If these values are then summed and divided by the number of statements, the resulting value indicates the minimal marginal reproducibility present for the set of statements.[15]

The minimal marginal reproducibility may then be subtracted from the coefficient of reproducibility obtained from the same data to note the improvement gained through scaling of items.

The Use of Statistical Tests

The main descriptive statistics used in this study are percentages and means. Though most of the data analyzed are in the form of an ordinal scale the mean is used rather than the median, since the mean is generally a more stable measure and varies less from sample to sample.[16]

---

[15] Allen L. Edwards, op. cit., p. 192

[16] Hubert M. Blalock Jr., Social Statistics, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960, p. 58.

In this study no attempt is made at statistical generalization of the results of the analyses of responses of students surveyed to a larger population. Statistical tests are used for evaluating differences in distributions of responses and of scores and ranks based upon these responses; that is, they are used as a "yardstick" for evaluating differences. It is realized that nonrandom factors in the selection of respondents tend to diminish the value of the statistics for evaluation of differences. In conjunction with the use of statistical tests, an attempt is made to determine whether regularities or patterns in responses are associated with the independent variables.

V. DEVELOPMENT OF SCALES AND TESTS OF HYPOTHESES

The Perception of Cheating Scale

This investigation of students' perceptions of cheating begins with an exploration of recurring situations faced by college students. The situations, as described by questionnaire items, have been chosen from a list of those most mentioned by students in response to an unstructured questionnaire asking for students' beliefs as to the kinds of behavior which constitute cheating.

Previous research indicates that students generally consider cheating as unethical, immoral or unjustified. For example, Middleton and Putney found that approximately 94 percent of the more than 500 college students to whom they administered questionnaires considered cheating on exams to be ethically wrong.[17] Similarly, Bowers found that 90% of his sample of over 5,000 students feel morally obliged not to cheat.[18] However, these results do not answer the question as to what these students disapprove of, when they disapprove of cheating, i. e., what behavioral situations do they define as cheating.

The possibility of variance in students' definition of various situations as cheating or not cheating has been acknowledged by several authors. Bowers faced this problem in classifying his respondents as cheaters by using data from an unpublished University of California study of students' opinions about what constitutes cheating to categorize his respondents.[19] Harry Johnson, in his discussion of Stouffers' study of conflicting norms in cheating situations presents the problem of variance among norms in a manner which, as indicated in the following quotation, rather neatly describes the problem which is explored in this study.

---

[17] Russell Middleton and Snell Putney, "Religion, Normative Standards, and Behavior," Sociometry, 25 (June 1962) pp. 141-152, p. 145.

[18] William J. Bowers, Student Dishonesty and Its Control in College, (New York: Bureau of Applied Social Research, Columbia University, 1964) p. 69.

> Yet, one of the ways in which social norms may vary, certainly, is in the degree of agreement among those who are subject to them concerning the exact range of permissible behavior. It is conceivable that "cheating" may be variously defined. Using prepared notes is presumably cheating, but suppose that a student has been studying desperately right up to the examination and, anxious lest he forget some key points, writes them down, without consulting friends or books, while he is waiting for the examination questions to be handed out. If he uses those notes during the examination, is he cheating? Opinions might differ.[20]

Students have been asked to indicate whether or not they consider a number of such situations as cheating. If all students agree that a particular situation described by a questionnaire item constitutes cheating this will indicate that among those students there is a shared definition of the situation described by the item. To the extent that students disagree in their designation of a particular situation as constituting cheating this will indicate the relative absence of such a shared definition.

---

[19] Bowers, op. cit., pp. 57-60.

[20] Harry M. Johnson, Sociology: A Systematic Introduction, (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1960), p. 28.

Two sets of data will be discussed here. The first consists of the responses of 89 Introductory Social Psychology students at a large Midwestern university[21] to a questionnaire consisting of 16 items, each describing a situation which might be considered cheating. This first instrument allows a 3 step response of Agree, Undecided or Disagree depending on whether the responding considered the behavior to be cheating. The second consists of the responses of 83 students attending the same Midwestern University (50 from a Political Science class and 33 from an Introductory Sociology course.) to an instrument consisting of the same 16 items but allowing a two step response of Yes or No.

The ordering of items for purposes of this discussion is presented in table 1 in terms of the average percent of respondents giving an Agree or Yes response to each item. It is evident that for each item, with several minor exceptions, the percent of respondents giving a Yes response is somewhat higher than the percent giving an Agree response. I assume this is a consequence of what might otherwise have been an undecided response being shifted to the Yes category.

---

[21] Michigan State University

Table 1 Rank Order Of Items Based On The Percent Of Respondents Who Consider Them As Describing Situations Which Constitute Cheating.

Item No.[a]	Item	% Agree	Rank	% Yes	Rank
4	Copying answers from another person's exam.	98	2.5	99	2.0
5	Copying from a friend's exam.	98	2.5	99	2.0
6	Having a friend take a final for you.	98	2.5	99	2.0
10	Obtaining answers to a test when you think it will be difficult.	98	2.5	90	7.5
16	Obtaining answers to a test when you don't have time to study.	96	5.0	98	4.0
1	Obtaining answers to test questions before a test is given and memorizing them.	84	7.0	82	13.5
3	Knowingly letting another person copy from your exam.	84	7.0	90	7.5
11	Obtaining answers to a test question from another person when other persons around you are doing it.	84	7.0	92	5.5
14	Copying the answer to a test question when you know it but can't recall it at the time.	82	9.0	87	11.0
7	Giving another person an answer to a test question, but not asking for one.	81	10.5	85	12.0
13	Obtaining answers to test questions when you feel this is necessary to pass the course.	81	10.5	92	5.5
8	Obtaining answers to a test that you consider to be unfair.	79	12.0	89	9.5
9	Obtaining answers to a test when you consider the teacher to be unfair.	78	13.5	89	9.5
15	Obtaining answers to a test when you know that others are, and you are being graded on a curve.	78	13.5	82	13.5
2	Asking another person, outside of class, what was included on an exam.	48	15.0	57	15.0
12	Obtaining answers to a previous exam when the instructor is known to use the same exam every year.	44	16.0	48	16.0

---

[a] The item number refers to the position of the item on the questionnaire.

A Spearman Coefficient of Rank-order Correlation was computed to provide an estimate of the relationship between the ranking of items on the basis of the percent of Agree responses and the ranking of the same items on the basis of the percent of Yes responses. The analysis resulted in a correlation of $rs = +.82$ ($p < .01$). This suggests that the rather high degree of agreement between the two sets of ranks is not a chance occurrence.

These data appear to warrant the following preliminary conclusions in regard to students definitions of situations as cheating or not cheating.

1. For the majority of the situations described by the questionnaire items used here, there is a rather high degree of consensus among students as to the definition of these situations as ones which constitute cheating.
2. The two sets of students utilized for this phase of the study show a high amount of agreement as to the relative degree to which various situations are defined as cheating.

This suggests that students in general do possess shared definitions of such situations and that a majority of students define a majority of behavioral situations which may be considered as cheating, as being such, and therefore violating the norm of academic honesty.

It is possible that the rather high degree of consensus in the definition of situations exhibited by these respondents is in part a consequence of the particular situations described in the questionnaire. It would be difficult to determine the degree to which these situations are representative of all possible situations faced by students which might be defined as cheating. However, five additional situations mentioned by students have been added to those described in the initial questionnaire in an effort to determine if there are more situations for which relatively low consensus exists.

The resulting questionnaire consists of 21 items to which a dichotomous response choice is allowed.

In the fall of 1962 this questionnaire was administered to 238 students at Western Michigan University.[22] These were students enrolled in one Industrial Sociology class and in three sections of Principles of Sociology.

As in the case of the previous questionnaires, each item describes a situation which may be considered as cheating. If the student considered the behavior described by the item as cheating he was instructed to circle the response category "C" and if he did not consider the behavior as constituting cheating he was instructed to circle the "NC" following the item.

Table 2 presents the 21 items ranked on the basis of the percent of respondents who designate each item as one which constitutes cheating.

---

[22] In analysis of the data 13 questionnaires were discarded because of students' failure to respond to one or more of the 21 items.

Table 2 Rank Order Of Items Based On The Percent Of Total Respondents Who Consider The Situation Described By The Item To Be Cheating.

Item No.	Item	"C" Responses %	Rank
4*	Copying answers from another person's exam.	100	2.0
5*	Copying from a friend's exam.	100	2.0
17	Looking at notes you have brought to class during an examination.	100	2.0
18	Looking at notes during an exam to remind you of an answer you have temporarily forgotten.	99	4.5
19	Copying from another person's exam when you need a good grade in the course in order to graduate.	99	4.5
6*	Having a friend take a final exam for you.	98	6.0
16*	Obtaining answers to a test when you don't have time to study.	97	7.0
10*	Obtaining answers to a test when you think it will be difficult.	96	8.5
20	Having a friend write a class paper for you.	96	8.5
1*	Obtaining answers to test questions before a test is given and memorizing them.	92	10.5
11*	Obtaining answers to a test question from another person when other persons around you in class are doing it.	92	10.5
3*	Knowingly letting another person copy from your exam.	91	12.0
9*	Obtaining answers to a test when you consider the teacher to be unfair.	90	13.0
8*	Obtaining answers to a test that you consider to be unfair.	89	14.0
14*	Copying the answer to a test question when you know it but can't recall it at the time.	88	15.0
15*	Obtaining answers to a test when you know that others are, and you are being graded on a curve.	84	16.0
13	Obtaining answers to a previous exam when the instructor uses the same exam every year but does not return them to the students.	83	17.0
7*	Giving another person an answer to a test question, but not asking for one.	81	18.0
12	Obtaining answers to a previous exam when the instructor uses the same exam every year and returns them to the student.	60	19.0
2*	Asking another person, outside of class, what was included on an exam.	56	20.0
21	Turning in the same paper to instructors in two different courses.	32	21.0

*These are the 14 items which were used in the initial exploratory phase of the study.

Here, as in the analysis of responses to the 16 item instrument, most of the students surveyed consider a majority of the situations described by questionnaire items as ones which constitute cheating. Analysis of these data also lends further support to the hypothesis that students demonstrate considerable consensus as to the relative degree to which various situations are considered to be cheating. This support is provided by the high values of the rank statistics used in comparing ranks for items as described in table 3. These analyses show that when respondents are compared, in total, and when categorized by sex and by class in the university, they demonstrate considerable agreement as to the relative rank of these situations.

This evidence leads to the following series of propositions.

1. Among students in general, there is high agreement as to whether most behaviors constitutes cheating.
2. The percent of students in one category who consider a particular behavior to constitute cheating may differ somewhat from the percent in another category who consider the same behavior to constitute cheating.
3. In spite of differences between the proportions of categories of students who consider a particular behavior as cheating, the relative proportions of students within each category who consider various behaviors to be cheating is rather constant among categories.

This third proposition infers that there is considerable consistency in the proportion of the student body who will consider a particular behavior to be cheating, or conversely, not cheating. Much of the following analysis will be concerned with investigating characteristics which appear to be most predominantly associated with these similarities and divergences in perceptions of cheating.

Table 3 **Comparisons Of Rank Orderings Of Items Ranked On The Basis Of The Percent Of Various Categories Of Respondents Who Consider Them As Descriptive Of Situations Constituting Cheating.**

	Data Compared	Statistic Used For Comparison	
1.	a. Ranking of 14 items based on percent of 89 students who respond "Agree" when asked to respond "Agree," "Undecided" or "Disagree" to the question of whether the situations described constitute cheating.	Coefficient of Concordance .92	$p < .01$
	b. Ranking of same 14 items based on percent of 83 students who respond "Yes" when asked to respond "Yes" or "No" to the question of whether the situations described constitute cheating.		
	c. Ranking of same 14 items based on percent of 225 students who respond "C" when asked to respond "C" (Cheating) or "NC" (Not Cheating) to the question of whether the situations described constitute cheating.		
2.	Ranking of 21 items based on percent of students responding "C" as described in 1.c. above. Comparison of all males (34) and all females (58) who are Freshmen and Sophomores.	Spearman Rank Order Correlations .88	$p < .01$
3.	Comparison as described in 2 (above) of all males (102) and all females (31) who are Juniors and Seniors.	.86	$p < .01$
4.	Comparison as described in 2 (above) of all Freshmen and Sophomore males (34) and all Junior and Senior males (102).	.83	$p < .01$
5.	Comparison as described in 2 (above) of all Freshman and Sophomore females (58) and all Junior and Senior females (31).	.81	$p < .01$

Scale Analysis

Unidimensionality

The high degree of correlation in the rank order of items used in the cheating questionnaire suggests a considerable stability in students' definitions of situations as cheating. This also suggests that these situations, as described by questionnaire items, have a single or uniform meaning for students in terms of their attitudinal orientation to these situations. Thus it appears that students do probably define these situations only in terms of whether they are cheating or not cheating, and not in terms of other possible attitudinal orientations. The question to be asked here is whether the items in the cheating questionnaire are unidimensional. To test this empirically I use scalogram analysis, or Guttman scaling.

In following the Guttman procedure the items used should be restricted to those which have marginals between .20 and .80. This has been done in the present case. The items selected for scale analysis are given below with their appropriate marginals. These are the 5 lowest ranked items in terms of the proportion of respondents who consider them as describing situations which constitute cheating. This means that any analysis involving scores derived from a scale based on these items will be an analysis of orientations to low consensus situations.

Table 4 Items Used For Scalogram Analysis (1962 Data)

Item No.	"C" Responses %	"NC" Responses %
13	83	17
7	81	19
12	60	40
2	56	44
21	32	68

Two of these 5 dichotomous items (13 and 7) slightly exceed the accepted marginal range of .20 - .80, however these are not so extreme as to present a serious problem for the scale analysis.

Scale analysis of these items produced an acceptable scale as indicated by the following scale characteristics. This indicates that these items are unidimensional.

Table 5 Scale Characteristics (1962 Data)

Coefficient of Reproducibility (R)	.92
Coefficient of Scalability (S)	.75
Minimal Marginal reproducibility (MMR)	.70
Improvement over MMR due to scaling	.22

The results of this initial scale analysis support the hypothesis that the questionnaire items receive responses indicative of a stable, unidimensional attitude toward cheating among these university students. As a further test of this hypothesis the same questionnaire was administered to selected classes of students in 1963 and again in 1964. The same items were again used for scale analysis of the responses of these students. The proportion of students considering each of these items as cheating or not cheating is given in table 6 for each of these several sets of students. Table 7 presents for all students who were administered the questionnaire the proportion considering each item as cheating or not cheating. In table 8 the ranks of scale items for each set of students is presented. These ranks are based upon the percent of students in each set who consider each item as descriptive of behavior which is not cheating. (These percentages are given in table 6). The high degree of agreement which exists among these ranks supports the proposition that within the student body from which these respondents were selected there is a consistent proportion of students who consider the situations described by these items as cheating or not cheating. This high rate of agreement also indicates that the ranking of situations indicated by the percentages of respondents considering them as cheating or not cheating, as given in table 6, is a relatively accurate one for this total body of students.

The scaling of the responses of the students surveyed in 1963 and 1964 also meets the standards for acceptability used for evaluating the scale based on the responses of students surveyed in 1962. The values for these measures are presented in Table 9. These values support the hypothesis that students perceptions of these situations as ones which do or do not constitute cheating form a unidimensional scale.

Table 6 Percent[a] Of Respondents In Each Of Three Selected Sets Of Students Who Consider Behaviors Described By Questionnaire Items As Cheating Or Not Cheating.

Selected Sets of Students According to Year In Which They Were Surveyed				Items		
		13	7	12	2	21
1962	C	83% (186)	81% (182)	60% (136)	56% (127)	32% (71)
	NC	17% (39)	19% (43)	40% (89)	44% (98)	68% (154)
1963	C	79% (135)	79% (134)	55% (93)	38% (65)	28% (48)
	NC	21% (35)	21% (36)	45% (77)	62% (105)	72% (122)
1964	C	80% (490)	77% (474)	61% (373)	48% (298)	24% (146)
	NC	20% (126)	23% (142)	39% (243)	52% (318)	76% (470)

[a] Number of cases is shown in parentheses.

Table 7 Percent[a] Of All Students Who Consider Selected Behaviors As Cheating Or Not Cheating

Items		C	NC
13	Obtaining answers to a previous exam when the instructor uses the same exam every year but does not return them to the student.	80% (811)	20% (200)
7	Giving another person an answer to a test question, but not asking for one.	78% (790)	22% (221)
12	Obtaining answers to a previous exam when the instructor uses the same exam every year and returns them to the student.	60% (602)	40% (409)
2	Asking another person, outside of class, what was included on an exam.	48% (490)	52% (521)
21	Turning in the same paper to instructors in two different courses.	26% (265)	74% (746)

[a] Number of cases is shown in parentheses. An overall total of 29 students were dropped for non-response to one or more of these items.

Table 8 Ranking Of Scale Items Based Upon The Proportion Of Students In Each Of Three Selected Sets Of Students Who Consider The Behavior Described By The Item As Not Cheating.

Items	1962 (N=225)	1963 (N=170)	1964 (N=616)
21	1.0	1.0	1.0
2	2.0	2.0	2.0
12	3.0	3.0	3.0
7	4.0	4.5	4.0
13	5.0	4.5	5.0

Coefficient of Concordance, $W = .98$, $p < .01$.

Table 9 Results Of Scale Analyses Of Students' Responses To Five Items Describing Behavior Which They Designated As Cheating Or Not Cheating.

Selected Aggregates Of Students According To Year In Which They Were Surveyed		Coefficient of Reproducibility	Coefficient of Scalability	Minimal Marginal Reproducibility	Improvement over MMR of Items
	N	R	S	MMR	
1962	(225)	.92	.75	.70	.22
1963	(170)	.92	.74	.69	.23
1964	(616)	.91	.71	.69	.22

Social Isolation

This phase of the study, which is concerned with social isolation within the social system of the university, began with a focus upon the general problem of alienation. To explore this problem a widely used alienation scale was employed, i.e. Sroles' Scale of Anomia.[23] The initial data to be examined consist of the responses in 1960 and 1961 of 213 undergraduate Introductory Sociology students from Michigan State University to the five items comprising the Srole's Scale of Anomia.

These items are given below. Each respondent was allowed a three choice response of Agree, Undecided, and Disagree. For purposes of this analysis an Agree response is considered as an anomic response, and an Undecided or Disagree response is considered as a non-anomic response.

---

[23] See Marshall B. Clinard (ed.), Anomie and Deviant Behavior, (New York: Macmillan, 1964), pp. 246-283, for a list of empirical studies of anomie. Many of these use Srole's scale.

Srole's Scale of Anomia

For each of the following statements, if you agree with the statement circle the "A" following the statement, if you disagree with the statement circle the "D" following the statement, and if you are undecided circle the "U" following the statement.

1. There's little use writing to public officials because often they aren't really interested in the problems of the average man. A D U
2. Nowadays a person has to live pretty much for today and let tomorrow take care of itself. A D U
3. In spite of what some people say, the lot of the average man is getting worse, not better. A D U
4. It's hardly fair to bring children into the world with the way things look for the future. A D U
5. These days a person doesn't really know whom he can count on. A D U

Table 10 Percent Of Respondents Giving Agree Responses To Each Of The Items Comprising Srole's Scale Of Anomia.

Item No.	Agree Responses (N=213) %
1	6.0
2	6.0
3	4.0
4	.9
5	17.0

It is noticeable that a rather low proportion of respondents give anomic responses to these items. One item stands out from the remainder in terms of a relatively high proportion of anomic responses. This is item 5, "These days a person doesn't really know whom he can count on." I interpret this result as an indication that the element of alienation which is most strongly indicated in the responses is that of social isolation. It suggests a feeling of being unable to predict that one will be able to establish meaningful relationships in his interaction with others.

Revision of Srole's Scale of Anomia

Srole's Scale of Anomia has been revised with the purpose of changing the content of items so as to present student respondents with choices which are more directly related to the institutional context within which they are performing the role of student.

Also, in revising the items I have placed what I feel is an increased emphasis upon the social isolation component of alienation since this appears to be an important element in the responses to the original Srole's Scale of Anomia.

These revised items were interspersed with an additional five items which were designed to tap feelings of powerlessness in terms of acquisition of grades.

The revised version of the scale was administered to 178 students in Introductory Sociology classes at Western Michigan University in the Spring of 1963. A total of 11 respondents have been discarded for

purposes of analysis: 1 respondent for failure to respond to the question concerning class position, and 10 respondents for failure to respond to one or more items comprising the anomia scale. This leaves a total N of 167 which is used in the analysis.

Revised Version of Srole's Scale of Anomia Designed for Use Within the University Situation

You may agree with some or all of the statements given below, or you may disagree with some or all of these statements. If you agree with a statement, circle the "A" following the statement. If you disagree with a statement, circle the "D" following the statement.

Anomia 1. Most students don't really care what happens to other students. A D

2. If a student can't get good grades it's his own fault. A D

Anomia 3. In spite of all the current talk about the importance of education the general situation of the average student is getting worse, not better. A D

4. With a little luck, any student can get good grades. A D

Anomia 5. Today a student has to live pretty much for today and let tomorrow take care of itself. A D

6. There is no sense in working hard for grades because grades are mostly a matter of chance. A D

Anomia 7. These days a student doesn't really know whom he can count on. A D

8. There is no sense in working too hard for grades because most teachers grade on the curve. A D

Anomia 9. There is little use in a student asking teachers for help because they aren't really interested in the problems of the average student. A D

10. A student can get any grade he wants if he is willing to work for it. A D

This revised version of the scale allows for a 2 choice response, Agree or Disagree. As in the original scale, an Agree response is considered as an anomic response, and a Disagree response is considered a non-anomic response.

In the analysis of responses to these revised anomia items respondents have been categorized according to sex and class in the university. This was done under the assumption that the differential socialization of males and females, and the effect of length of time spent within the social system of the university, should have an effect upon a respondents' feelings of alienation. The percentages of respondents giving agree responses to these items is presented in Table 11.

Table 11 Percent Of Respondents Giving Agree Responses To Each Of The Items Comprising The Revised Version Of Srole's Scale Of Anomia.

Item No.	Total Respondents N=167 Percent Who Agree	Freshmen N=22 Percent Who Agree	Sophomores N=89 Percent Who Agree	Juniors N=36 Percent Who Agree	Seniors N=20 Percent Who Agree	Males N=93 Percent Who Agree	Females N=74 Percent Who Agree
1	53	41	53	53	70	64	39
3	28	36	28	33	10	30	26
5	17	9	21	17	10	19	15
7	40	32	40	33	60	41	39
9	14	4	19	6	20	20	7

It is evident that a much higher proportion of respondents give Agree or anomic responses to the items constituting this revised version of the Srole's Scale of Anomia than to the original scale items. This may be a consequence of both the revised content of the items and the change in response alternatives which allows only an Agree or a Disagree response.

It is noteworthy that the items with the two highest percentages of Agree responses, items 1 and 7, are both concerned with interpersonal relations, or social isolation. Item 9 which also belongs in this general area has a low percentage of Agree responses, but this item is of particular importance since it concerns perceived relations with teachers and is therefore central to the problem focus of the study.

Respondents were categorized according to class in the university, and these categories ranked on the basis of the percent of agree responses given to each item. These rankings are presented in Table 12.

Table 12 Rank Of Students In Class Categories Of Freshman Through Senior Based Upon The Percent Responding "Agree" To Each Of The Five Items Comprising The Revised Version Of The Srole Scale Of Anomia.

Item No.	Freshmen Rank	Sophomores Rank	Juniors Rank	Seniors Rank
1	4.0	2.5	2.5	1.0
3	1.0	3.0	2.0	4.0
5	4.0	1.0	2.0	3.0
7	4.0	2.0	3.0	1.0
9	4.0	2.0	3.0	1.0
Sums of Ranks	17.0	10.5	12.5	10.0

$W = .24; p > .05$

The sums of ranks suggest little patterning in the ordering of categories of respondents, and the coefficient indicates a low degree of association among the sets of rankings. However, a comparison of male and female respondents does suggest an association between sex and anomic responses as indicated by the data in Table 13.

Table 13 Percent Of Male And Female Respondents Giving Agree Responses To Each Of The Items Comprising The Revised Version Of The Srole Scale Of Anomia

	Agree Responses	
	Males	Females
Item No.	(N=93)	(N=74)
1	64	39
3	30	26
5	19	15
7	41	39
9	20	7
Mean	34.8	25.2

Male - Female differences appear to be particularly marked in the case of responses to items 1 and 9. These two items are both designed to be indicators of the social isolation component of alienation in its subjective form. That is, both are designed to reflect a perception of others as being unwilling to relate to the respondent. In the case of item 1 this perception is directed toward other students, in the case of item 9 this perception is directed toward the teacher.

As a statistical check on the evident association between sex and the social isolation component of alienation, and the evident lack of association between class in the university and alienation, chi-square tests were computed on the Agree - Disagree responses to each item of the revised version of the Srole Scale of Anomia. The results of these tests, presented in tables 14 and 15 suggest that the main difference that exists among students in terms of anomic orientations is the difference between male and female students in terms of their perception of the willingness of teachers and of other students to relate to them.

Table 14 Chi-Square Analysis Of Responses To Items Comprising The Revised Version Of The Srole Scale Of Anomia When Respondents Are Categorized By Class In The University

Item No.	Chi-Square Value	Degrees of Freedom	Probability
1	3.61	3	N. S.
3	4.47	3	N. S.
5	2.80	3	N. S.
7	4.62	3	N. S.
9	6.13	3	N. S.

Table 15 Chi-Square Analysis Of Responses To Items Comprising The Revised Version Of The Srole Scale Of Anomia When Respondents Are Categorized By Sex

Item No.	Chi-Square Value	Degrees of Freedom	Probability
1	10.62	1	$P < .05$
3	.40	1	N. S.
5	.58	1	N. S.
7	.05	1	N. S.
9	6.26	1	$P < .05$

Social Isolation and Perception of Cheating

It has been hypothesised that students' perceived isolation within the social system of the university will be related to their perceptions of cheating. As an initial check of this hypothesis, a comparison is presented in table 16 of the average number of total items designated as not cheating by students who responded Agree or Disagree to the two social isolation items selected from the revised Srole's Scale. The data in table 16 are from students surveyed in 1963.

Table 16 Mean Number Of Total Items Designated As Not Cheating By Students Who Agree Or Disagree With The Two Social Isolation Items Selected From The Revised Srole's Scale In 1963.

	Agree		Disagree	
Item	N	Mean	N	Mean
1. Most Students don't really care what happens to other students.	93	3.40	82	3.30
9. There is little use in a student asking teachers for help because they aren't really interested in the problems of the average student.	24	5.04	150	3.12

The observed differences between the number of items designated as not cheating are in the same direction for both social isolation items. Both perceived isolation from teachers and perceived isolation from students appear to be positively associated with the number of items designated as not cheating. However, this relationship appears to be much stronger in the case of perceived isolation from teachers.

It has been hypothesised that perceived isolation from students would result in fewer items being designated as not cheating. This hypothesis is not supported. The hypothesis was based on the assumption that students would define more situations as not cheating, than would faculty. Therefore, closer integration and interaction with students should result in more situations being defined as not cheating. However, since the initial analysis of student responses to the perception of cheating questionnaire has indicated that there are differences among students in their perceptions of which situations are not cheating perhaps it should not be expected that isolation from other students will have a strong uniform effect upon a student's perception of cheating. However, this relationship will be investigated further through the use of cheating scale scores.

Social Isolation and Cheating Scale Scores

The scale analysis of responses to the perception of cheating questionnaire indicates that students' perceptions of cheating, as measured by responses to items selected from this questionnaire, form a stable unidimensional scale. Therefore, in the remaining analysis of the relation between social isolation and perception of cheating, scores derived from these scales will be used.

Responses to the Two Social Isolation Items Selected From the Revised Sroles' Scale as Related to Cheating Scale Scores

The cheating scales are based upon responses to five items from the cheating questionnaire which have marginal responses of approximately 20%-80%. The scales utilize the "not cheating" responses to each item. Therefore, the higher the scale score, the greater the number of scale items designated as not cheating. These scale scores are interpreted as representing a students attitudinal orientation to the norm of academic honesty.

As indicated in the preceding discussion, the same students who in 1963 responded to the two social isolation items selected from the revised Srole's Scale also responded to the cheating questionnaire from which items were selected for scaling. Table 17 presents a comparison of mean cheating scale scores for those who give isolated and non-isolated responses to these social isolation items.

The differences in mean scale scores for isolated and non-isolated students are in this case both in the predicted direction. Respondents who are isolated from other students have lower average scale scores than those who are not so isolated. On the other hand, those who are isolated from teachers have higher average scores than those not isolated from teachers.

This relationship of cheating scale scores to isolation from teachers is the same as that observed in the analysis of raw scores presented in Table 16. The relationship of cheating scale scores to isolation from other students is the opposite of that suggested by the data in Table 16.

2

Table 17 Mean Cheating Scale Scores For Students Giving Isolated And Non-Isolated Responses To The Two Social Isolation Items From The Revised Sroles' Scale In 1963.

Items	Isolated Response (Agree) N	Mean	Non-Isolated Response (Disagree) N	Mean	Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test[a]
1. Student Isolation	90	2.09	80	2.28	$.30 > p < .50$
9. Teacher Isolation	24	2.96	146	2.05	$.01 > p < .02$

[a] The test used is the one-tailed test for large samples. In using this test the maximum difference, in the predicted direction, between the cummulative percentage distributions of the two sets of scores is converted to a value which has a sampling distribution which is approximated by the chi-square distribution with df=2. For a discussion of this test see: Sidney Siegel, *Nonparametric Statistics For The Behavioral Sciences*, (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1956), pp. 131-136.

In an attempt to resolve this contradiction the Kolmogorov - Smirnov test of agreement between two cummulative distributions has been used to evaluate the difference between the distribution of scale scores for isolates and non-isolates. This test is used to determine if isolation from students and isolation from teachers are each independently related to perception of cheating. The results of this test as indicated by the probability values in table 17 suggest that isolation from teachers is independently related to perceptions of cheating but that isolation from students is not related to perceptions of cheating.

As a further check upon this relationship an analysis of these same types of data has been done for students surveyed in 1964. The results of this analysis are presented in table 18.

Table 18 Mean Cheating Scale Scores For Students Giving Isolated And Non-Isolated Responses To The Two Social Isolation Items From The Revised Sroles' Scale In 1964.

	Isolated Response (Agree)		Non-Isolated Response (Disagree)		
Items	N	Mean	N	Mean	Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test
1. Student Isolation	258	2.10	355	1.97	p. > .10[a]
9. Teacher Isolation	74	2.34	536	1.98	.001> p< .01[b]

[a] A two-tailed test

[b] A one-tailed test

In this case a two-tailed test has been used for analysis of the relation between isolation from students and perception of cheating, since the difference between cheating scale scores is in the direction opposite to that which has been predicted. As in the preceding analysis, the results of this test suggests that isolation from students is not independently related to perceptions of cheating.

The analysis of isolation from teachers and cheating scale scores lends further support to the evidence in table 17 that isolation from teachers is independently related to perception of cheating.

It may be that the effect of isolation from students upon cheating scores, when considered independently, is obscured by the respondents' isolation or non-isolation from teachers. Therefore, a comparison of mean cheating scores of isolates and non-isolates, controlling for each type of isolation, is presented in table 19 for the students surveyed in 1963 and 1964.

The data in this table indicate that when respondents surveyed in 1963 are controlled for each type of isolation the other form of isolation has the predicted effect upon perceptions of cheating. The differences in means indicate a greater effect of isolation from teachers upon perceptions of cheating than the effect of isolation from students upon these perceptions. This effect would be expected on the basis of the strong independent relationship of isolation from teachers to perceptions of cheating.

Table 19 Comparison Of Mean Cheating Scale Scores Of Isolates And Non-Isolates, Controlling For Each Type Of Isolation Separately

Respondents Categorized By Form Of Isolation	1963 Data N	1963 Data Mean Scale Scores	1964 Data N	1964 Data Mean Scale Scores
Isolation From Teachers				
Isolated From Students				
Isolated From Teachers	14	2.79	51	2.47
Not-Isolated From Teachers	76	1.96	205	2.02
Not-Isolated From Students				
Isolated From Teachers	10	3.20	23	2.30
Not-Isolated From Teachers	70	2.14	329	1.94
Isolation From Students				
Isolated From Teachers				
Isolated From Students	14	2.79	51	2.47
Not-Isolated From Students	10	3.20	23	2.30
Not-Isolated From Teachers				
Isolated From Students	76	1.96	205	2.02
Not-Isolated From Students	70	2.14	329	1.94

The data from students surveyed in 1964 provide support for the predicted effect of isolation from teachers upon students' perceptions of cheating. These data do not provide support for the predicted relationship between isolation from students and perceptions of cheating. On the basis of this result and the previously indicated weak independent effect of perceived isolation from students upon perceptions of cheating, I conclude that there is no clear and consistent relationship between these two variables and that the evidence does not support Hypothesis V.

Elaboration of the Analysis of the Relationship Between Isolation From Teachers and Perceptions of Cheating

Sex and Class in the University

Since perceived isolation from teachers appears to have a clear and consistent effect upon students' perceptions of cheating the remaining analysis will focus upon this form of isolation, and Hypotheses VII and X will not be tested further. It has been hypothesised that both sex of respondent and the respondents' class in the university would be related to social isolation and perception of cheating. The initial analysis of these relationships indicated that sex of respondent is related to perceived isolation, but that the respondents' class in the university is not related to isolation. The following analysis provides a further check upon the relation of these two variables to perceived isolation from teachers.

The data in table 20 are based on the responses of students surveyed in 1964. The isolated and non-isolated responses of male and female students are compared, controlling for the effects of class.

Among all students a slightly higher proportion of male than of female students give isolated responses. This difference persists when responses are controlled for the effect of class in the university, except among Freshmen students. Since Freshmen would have had a minimum of experience in the social system of the university, this exception to the overall pattern possibly reflects pre-existing perceptions rather than perceptions formed in the course of interaction within the university.

Table 20 Responses Of Male And Female Students Surveyed In 1964 To The Teacher Isolation Item From The Revised Sroles' Scale

	Males		Females	
	N	%	N	%
Total				
Isolated Response	31	13	42	11
Non-Isolated Response	205	87	329	89
Seniors				
Isolated Response	7	16	1	5
Non-Isolated Response	36	84	19	95
Juniors				
Isolated Response	10	13	6	10
Non-Isolated Response	65	87	54	90
Sophomores				
Isolated Response	12	16	15	10
Non-Isolated Response	63	84	129	90
Freshmen				
Isolated Response	2	4	20	14
Non-Isolated Response	41	95	127	86

These same data are examined in Table 21 to determine if there is a consistent effect of class upon perceived isolation from teachers. In this table, classes are ranked, controlling for sex, on the basis of the percent of males or females in each class who give an isolated response. The class with the highest proportion of isolated responses is given a rank of "1", that with the lowest a rank of "4". These ranks indicate no consistent effects of class, suggesting that class in the university is not related to perceived isolation from teachers.

As hypothesised, perceived isolation from teachers is positively associated with the number of situations defined as not cheating.

Table 21 Ranking Of Male And Female Isolated Respondents According To Class In The University, Controlling For The Effects Of Sex

	Males		Females	
	%	Rank	%	Rank
Seniors	16	1.5	5	4.0
Juniors	13	3.0	10	2.5
Sophomores	16	1.5	10	2.5
Freshmen	4	4.0	14	1

A corollary of this proposition is: "characteristics of respondents which are associated with perceived isolation from teachers will be similarly associated with the number of situations defined as not cheating."

Thus, it is hypothesised that males are more likely to define a situation as not cheating than are females, and that a respondent's class in the university will have no marked or consistent effect upon the students' definition of a situation as cheating or not cheating.

The initial test of these relationships consists of a chi-square analysis of the effects of these two variables upon responses to each item in the cheating questionnaire. The first comparison is of the percent of male and female respondents surveyed in 1962 who consider each item in the questionnaire to be descriptive of behavior which is not cheating. Tables 23 and 24 present this same analysis for students surveyed in 1963 and 1964.

Table 22 Percent Of Male And Female Students Surveyed In 1962 Who Give A "Not Cheating" Response To Each Item In The Cheating Questionnaire

Item No.	Males N=95 %	Females N=71 %	Chi-Square	
1	16	10	1.24	N. S.
2	65	58	.97	N. S.
3	18	3	9.11	p <.05
4	1	-	-	
5	1	-	-	
6	1	-	-	
7	28	13	5.93	p <.05
8	16	11	.70	N. S.
9	17	8	2.49	N. S.
10	7	1	3.15	p <.05
11	17	10	1.66	N. S.
12	53	37	4.20	p <.05
13	28	13	5.93	p <.05
14	15	6	3.48	p <.05
15	27	13	5.27	p <.05
16	3	3	.02	N, S.
17	4	-	-	
18	19	1	1.73	N. S.
19	4	-	-	
20	7	3	1.64	N. S.
21	73	72	.01	N. S.

Since direction is hypothesised, a one-tailed test is employed. This means that with 1 degree of freedom a chi-square value of 2.71 would be significant at the .05 level. From table 22 it can be seen that with the exception of one item (item 16) a higher percentage of males than of females consider each item to be not cheating. For seven of these items the difference between male and female responses results in a statistically significant chi-square value. The data clearly indicate that these observed differences in male-female responses are not likely to be a chance occurrence and that males are more likely than females to define a situation as not cheating. Further support for this proposition is provided by the data presented in tables 23 and 24.

Table 23 Percent Of Male And Female Students Surveyed In 1963 Who Give A "Not Cheating" Response To Each Item In The Cheating Questionnaire

Item No.	Males N=136 %	Females N=89 %	Chi-Square	
1	9	6	.79	N. S.
2	46	39	1.07	N. S.
3	96	79	.19	N. S.
4	-	-	-	
5	-	-	-	
6	3	-	-	
7	21	16	1.09	N. S.
8	14	6	3.94	p <.05
9	14	4	5.26	p <.05
10	5	3	.40	N. S.
11	12	1	9.46	p <.05
12	51	22	17.97	p <.05
13	23	9	7.16	p <.05
14	11	14	.31	N. S.
15	20	9	4.83	p <.05
16	4	1	1.35	N. S.
17	-	1	-	
18	2	1	.05	N. S.
19	2	1	.05	N. S.
20	4	2	.73	N. S.
21	74	60	5.39	p <.05

Table 24 Percent Of Male And Female Students Surveyed In 1964 Who Give A "Not Cheating" Response To Each Item In The Cheating Questionnaire

	Males		Females			
Item No.	Total N	%	Total N	%	Chi-Square	
1	243	13	385	5	13.53	p < .05
2	243	58	385	48	6.44	p < .05
3	244	13	387	6	8.06	p < .05
4	244	12	387	-	-	
5	244	12	387	-	-	
6	244	12	387	-	-	
7	242	27	384	21	3.74	p < .05
8	244	23	386	8	26.74	p < .05
9	244	18	387	8	13.47	p < .05
10	244	8	387	4	3.81	p < .05
11	244	11	387	5	8.39	p < .05
12	243	51	385	32	23.39	p < .05
13	241	30	387	14	21.53	p < .05
14	243	19	387	10	11.46	p < .05
15	242	18	385	12	4.55	p < .05
16	244	4	387	1	5.08	p < .05
17	244	4	386	2	2.30	N. S.
18	244	8	385	4	3.14	p < .05
19	244	6	386	2	7.14	p < .05
20	243	10	386	6	2.27	N. S.
21	244	80	385	72	5.95	p < .05

Since sex is clearly independently related to perceptions of cheating, this variable is controlled while testing for the effect of class in the university. This analysis will be carried out with the data from respondents surveyed in 1963 and 1964. The greater number of respondents involved in each of these surveys will increase the possibility of a relationship between class and perception of cheating being revealed by the analysis if such a relationship exists. Tables 25 through 28 contain the data used in this analysis. For the purposes of this analysis, class categories have been combined into two categories of students who have spent greater and lesser amounts of time within the social system of the university. The responses of Seniors and Juniors are compared with those of Sophomores and Freshmen, for both male and female students. Since previous analysis has indicated no clear and consistent direction of relationship between class and social isolation, direction of relationship is not hypothesised in this analysis. Thus a two-tailed test is used and this requires a chi-square value of 3.84 for the test statistic to be significant at the .05 level. These data indicate no clear and consistent, nor marked effect of class in the university upon perceptions of cheating. There is no consistent pattern to the differences in not cheating responses of the two class categories and the few instances in which the value of the chi-square test is statistically significant could easily be a chance occurrence.

Table 25 Percent Of Male Students Surveyed In 1963, Categorized By Class In The University, Who Give A "Not Cheating" Response To Each Item In The Cheating Questionnaire

Item No.	Seniors and Juniors N=102 %	Sophomores and Freshmen N=34 %	Chi-Square	
1	10	6	.49	N. S.
2	49	38	1.19	N. S.
3	9	12	.26	N. S.
4	-	-	-	
5	-	-	-	
6	4	-	-	
7	20	26	.72	N. S.
8	16	9	1.00	N. S.
9	17	6	2.47	N. S.
10	6	3	.45	N. S.
11	15	6	1.82	N. S.
12	57	32	6.13	$p < .05$
13	28	6	7.37	$p < .05$
14	9	18	2.02	N. S.
15	22	12	1.86	N. S.
16	4	3	.07	N. S.
17	-	-	-	
18	-	6	-	
19	2	-	-	
20	6	-	-	
21	79	59	5.66	$p < .05$

Table 26 Percent Of Female Students Surveyed In 1963, Categorized By Class In The University, Who Give A "Not Cheating" Response To Each Item In The Cheating Questionnaire

Item No.	Seniors and Juniors N=31 %	Sophomores and Freshmen N=58 %	Chi-Square	
1	13	2	4.76	$p < .05$
2	36	41	.29	N. S.
3	6	9	.13	N. S.
4	-	-	-	
5	-	-	-	
6	-	-	-	
7	16	16	.00	N. S.
8	3	7	.51	N. S.
9	3	5	.18	N. S.
10	3	3	.00	N. S.
11	3	-	-	
12	26	21	.30	N. S.
13	10	9	.03	N. S.
14	10	16	.59	N. S.
15	13	7	.89	N. S.
16	3	-	-	
17	3	-	-	
18	-	2	-	
19	-	2	-	
20	3	2	.21	N. S.
21	55	62	.44	N. S.

Table 27 Percent Of Male Students Surveyed In 1964, Categorized By Class In The University, Who Give A "Not Cheating" Response To Each Item In The Cheating Questionnaire

	Seniors and Juniors		Sophomores and Freshmen			
Item No.	Total N	%	Total N	%	Chi-Square	
1	121	15	121	10	1.37	N. S.
2	120	58	122	58	.00	N. S.
3	121	13	122	13	.00	N. S.
4	121	-	122	2	-	
5	121	-	122	2	-	
6	121	1	122	2	.33	N. S.
7	120	26	121	28	.16	N. S.
8	121	16	122	29	5.13	$p < .05$
9	121	15	122	20	1.31	N. S.
10	121	8	122	7	.26	N. S.
11	121	9	122	12	.65	N. S.
12	121	53	121	49	.41	N. S.
13	120	32	120	28	.50	N. S.
14	120	20	122	18	.15	N. S.
15	120	17	121	19	.22	N. S.
16	121	2	122	7	3.70	N. S.
17	121	3	122	6	.83	N. S.
18	121	7	122	9	.49	N. S.
19	121	8	122	3	2.78	N. S.
20	120	7	122	12	2.23	N. S.
21	121	83	122	78	.87	N. S.

Table 28 Percent Of Female Students Surveyed In 1964, Categorized By Class In The University, Who Give A "Not Cheating" Response To Each Item In The Cheating Questionnaire

	Seniors and Juniors Total N	%	Sophomores and Freshmen Total N	%	Chi-Square	
1	82	4	301	5	.25	N. S.
2	83	51	300	47	.28	N. S.
3	83	4	302	7	1.44	N. S.
4	83	-	302	-	-	
5	83	-	302	-	-	
6	83	-	302	-	-	
7	83	17	299	22	.94	N. S.
8	82	2	302	10	4.74	$p < .05$
9	83	7	302	9	.16	N. S.
10	83	5	302	4	.12	N. S.
11	83	5	302	5	.00	N. S.
12	82	34	301	31	.25	N. S.
13	83	16	302	14	.16	N. S.
14	83	8	302	10	.17	N. S.
15	83	7	300	13	1.89	N. S.
16	83	1	302	1	.01	N. S.
17	83	2	301	2	.00	N. S.
18	83	4	300	5	.17	N. S.
19	83	1	301	2	.23	N. S.
20	83	4	301	7	1.26	N. S.
21	82	71	301	72	.06	N. S.

Development Of An Isolation From Teachers Scale

In order to carry out a more detailed investigation of the relationship of perceived isolation from teachers and perceptions of cheating an isolation from teachers scale was developed. The items used in the questionnaire from which this scale was developed were selected from a series of statements given by students in response to an open-ended questionnaire asking for their opinion as to how a teacher might relate to his students. Ten items were used in this questionnaire, which is presented below.

Isolation From Teachers Questionnaire

Listed below are a number of ways in which a teacher might indicate his recognition of a student or students in his class. Please answer the questions in terms of your general impression of university teachers.

Most Teachers:

Yes No 1. Learn the names of their students.
Yes No 2. Encourage students to talk with them.
Yes No 3. Like to drink coffee with their students at the Student Center.
Yes No 4. Are willing to discuss students' marks with them.
Yes No 5. Recognize and greet students outside of class.
Yes No 6. Respect the opinions of students in class
Yes No 7. Are as friendly with students as with other teachers.
Yes No 8. Are aware of student activities.
Yes No 9. Are willing to listen to students' academic problems.
Yes No 10. Are willing to listen to students' personal problems.

Since the Freshmen students surveyed in 1964 had little or no opportunity to experience interaction with faculty, (of the type described in the questionnaire), analyses using data from this questionnaire are restricted to the responses of Sophomores, Juniors, and Seniors. Table 29 presents the responses of these students to each item. The "No" response is interpreted as an isolated response.

Table 29 Distribution Of Responses Of Sophomore, Junior, and Senior Students, Surveyed In 1964, To Each Item Of The Teacher Isolation Questionnaire.

(Total N = 438)

		Percent of Those Responding Who Give A "Yes or A "No" Response	
Item No.	**No. of Respondents Giving A "Yes" Or A "No" Response**	**Yes %**	**No %**
1*	**429**	**62**	**38**
2	**428**	**77**	**23**
3	**418**	**9**	**91**
4	**425**	**92**	**8**
5*	**416**	**63**	**37**
6	**421**	**88**	**11**
7*	**420**	**35**	**64**
8*	**418**	**77**	**23**
9	**424**	**88**	**12**
10*	**415**	**35**	**65**

***Items used for scale analysis.**

Since previous analysis has indicated that male students exhibit greater perceived isolation from teachers than female students, responses to these items were examined in terms of the percent of isolated responses given by males and females. These comparisons are presented in Table 30.

Table 30 Percent Of Males And Females Among Sophomores, Juniors, And Seniors Surveyed In 1964 Who Give Isolated Responses To Each Item Of The Teacher Isolation Questionnaire.

	Percent of all Males Responding Who Give A "No" (Isolated) Response		Percent of all Females Responding Who Give A "No" (Isolated) Response	
Item No.	**Total N**	**%**	**Total N**	**%**
1	**197**	**38**	**236**	**36**
2	**196**	**27**	**232**	**19**
3	**193**	**87**	**225**	**93**
4	**194**	**7**	**231**	**7**
5	**193**	**38**	**223**	**35**
6	**195**	**10**	**227**	**11**
7	**191**	**57**	**229**	**70**
8	**193**	**19**	**225**	**25**
9	**195**	**12**	**229**	**11**
10	**189**	**62**	**226**	**66**

An inspection of this table indicates that there are not marked, nor clear and consistent differences in the responses of males and females to these items. Thus, this more detailed examination of perceived isolation from teachers suggests that sex of a student does not strongly affect perceived isolation from teachers. However, sex of the student may affect the relationship between perceived isolation from teachers and perception of cheating, as was suggested by previous analysis.

In order to examine this relationship, 5 items with 20%-80% marginals were selected for scale analysis from the 10 items comprising the Teacher Isolation Questionnaire. These were items 8, 5, 1, 10, and 7.

Since a relatively high percent of respondents did not respond to the items comprising the scale special procedures were employed to cope with this problem. These procedures are described below.

1. All respondents who did not respond to more than one item used for scale analysis were dropped from the scale analysis. A total of 24 respondents were dropped from the scale analysis for non-response, leaving a total of 414 respondents for the scale analysis.
2. Those respondents who did not respond to one item used for scale analysis were attributed a response for that item which conformed to their majority pattern of response. Thus, if the respondent had given a "yes" response to the majority of the items used for scale analysis he was given a "yes" response for that item to which he had not responded. The responses of 17 respondents were adjusted in this manner.

Following these procedures the responses of the 414 students to the 5 items selected for scale analysis were scaled using the scale analysis procedure described earlier. This scale analysis resulted in a coefficient of reproducibility of .90, indicating an acceptable unidimensional scale, though the value of the scale is weakened by the relatively high no response rate.

Of these 414 respondents, 404 are utilized in the analysis of the relationship between isolation from teachers and perceptions of cheating, since 10 respondents were dropped for failure to respond to one or more items comprising the cheating scale.

Analysis Of The Effect Of Isolation From Teachers Upon Perception Of Cheating, Using The Teacher Isolation Scale And The Cheating Scale.

For purposes of this analysis respondents' Teacher Isolation Scale scores have been dichotomized into high and low categories. Scores of 3-5 are considered as high scores and scores of 0-2 as low scores. The mean cheating scale scores of respondents, controlled by sex, who have high and low Teacher Isolation Scale scores are presented in Table 31.

Table 31 Mean Cheating Scale Scores Of Male And Female Respondents Who Have High And Low Teacher Isolation Scale Scores.

Teacher Isolation Scale Scores	N	Total (N=404) Mean	N	Males (N=185) Mean	N	Females (N=219) Mean
High (3-5)	163	2.45	73	3.08	90	1.93
Low (0-2)	241	1.92	112	1.97	129	1.88

From the data in this table it is evident that those respondents who have higher Teacher Isolation Scale scores have higher cheating scale scores. This indicates that greater isolation from teachers influences a student to define more situations as not cheating. These data also indicate that this effect of isolation from teachers is greater for males than for females.

A check upon the evident differences between these means is provided by analysis of the differences in distributions of Cheating Scale scores for those who score high and low on the Teacher Isolation Scale. The differences in these distributions results in Kolmogorov-Smirnov test values with these significance levels; differences between total respondents with high and low isolation scores $.001 > p < .01$, difference between males with high and low isolated scores $p < .001$, and, difference between females with high and low isolation scores $.50 > p < .70$.

The data in Table 31 also illustrate the combined effects of sex and isolation from teachers upon perceptions of cheating. Both isolation from teachers and the quality of being a male are evidently positively associated with the number of situations defined as not cheating. The combination of these variables thus results in the following rank order of respondents in terms of Cheating Scale scores.

Rank	Type Of Student	Mean Cheating Scale Scores
1	Isolated Males	3.08
2	Non-Isolated Males	1.97
3	Isolated Females	1.93
4	Non-Isolated Females	1.88

Reported Contact With Teachers And Perceptions Of Cheating

In the later phase of the study a question was placed on the cover sheet of the questionnaire which allows a partial check upon the assumption that interaction with teachers is related to perceptions of cheating. This question, given below, asks a respondent to indicate the amount of contact with teachers since he has been in the university. Responses of 228 of the Sophomores, Juniors, and Seniors used in the preceding analysis are available for this analysis.

Teacher Contact Question

During the time you have been attending Western Michigan University, about how many times have you discussed personal or academic concerns with a teacher?

None___1___2___3 or more___

For purposes of analysis responses to this question have been dichotomized into two categories, those who respond none or 1 time, and those who respond 2, or 3 or more times. The mean Cheating Scale scores of these two categories of students, controlled for the effects of sex, are presented in Table 32.

Table 32 Mean Cheating Scale Scores Of Students With Greater And Lesser Reported Contact With Teachers.

Reported Contact With Teachers	Total (N=228) Mean	Males (N=77) Mean	Females (N=151) Mean
None or 1 time	2.08	2.27	1.97
2 or 3 or more times	1.84	2.00	1.77

Inspection of the means in this table indicates that the relationship between contact with teachers and perceptions of cheating is similar to the relationship between perceived isolation from teachers and perceptions of cheating. It is evident that both being a male and having limited contact with teachers have the effect of increasing the number of situations defined as not cheating. The combined effects of these two variables produces a rank order of respondents, based on mean cheating Scale scores, similar to that produced in the preceding analysis which utilized Teacher Isolation Scale scores.

Rank	Categories Of Students	Mean Cheating Scale Scores
1	Males with less teacher contact	2.27
2	Males with greater teacher contact	2.00
3	Females with less teacher contact	1.97
4	Females with greater teacher contact	1.77

Comparison of Student and Faculty Perceptions of Cheating

A corollary assumption to the assumed effect of interaction with teachers upon perceptions of cheating is the assumption that faculty members are less likely to define a particular situation as not cheating than are students. In order to provide a partial check upon this assumption for this study the cheating questionnaire was administered to the other 17 faculty members teaching in the Department of Sociology and Anthropology of Western Michigan University. A comparison of the percent of these faculty members responding to each item who designated each as not cheating is presented in Table 33 for comparison with the same responses of the three sets of students whose responses to this questionnaire have been previously analyzed.

Table 33 Comparison Of The Percent Of "Not Cheating" Responses Given To Each Item In The Cheating Questionnaire By Faculty Members And Students

	Percent of Respondents Responding to Each Item Who Designate it as "Not Cheating"			
	Faculty Members 1965 (N=17)	Students 1962 (N=225)	Students 1963 (N=166)	Students 1964 (N=630)
Item No.	%	%	%	%
1	*-	8	13	8
2	53	44	62	50
3	6	9	11	9
4	-	-	1	1
5	-	-	1	1
6	-	2	1	1
7	-	19	22	23
8	-	11	14	14
9	-	10	13	12
10	-	4	5	6
11	6	8	14	7
12	88	40	46	39
13	35	17	22	20
14	-	12	11	13
15	12	16	21	14
16	-	3	3	2
17	-	-	2	3
18	-	1	4	6
19	-	1	2	3
20	-	4	5	8
21	62	68	72	75

* Of course, the "0" % in this column means that 100% of the teachers designated the behavior described by a questionnaire item as one which constitutes cheating.

The overall pattern of differences in responses evident in this table supports the assumption that faculty members are less likely to define a particular situation as not cheating than are students. However, there are several exceptions to this pattern which can be noted. These exceptions occur in the responses to items 2, 12, and 13.

Item 2

"Asking another person, outside of class, what was included on an exam."

It appears that both faculty and students are about evenly split in their definition of this situation. It seems likely that this is in part a consequence of the specifically "out of the classroom" setting of the situation described. It is noteworthy that the same lack of consensus about this situation which obtains among students also evidently is found among teachers.

Item 12

"Obtaining answers to a previous exam when the instructor uses the same exam every year and returns them to the student."

Item 13

"Obtaining answers to a previous exam when the instructor uses the same exam every year but does not return them to the student."

Evidently teachers are more likely to define these two situations as not cheating than are students. Very likely teachers see the burden of responsibility for these situations as resting upon themselves rather than the students.

Perceptions of Cheating and Self-Report of Cheating Behavior

It is not an objective of this study to examine actual cheating behavior among students. Nevertheless, it is at least implicitly assumed that definition of a situation as not cheating and engaging in the behavior described in the situation are positively associated. Bower's recent extensive study[24] of reported cheating in American colleges and universities provides the basis for a partial check of this assumption. In Table 34 is presented a comparison of the percent of respondents in this study who admit committing a specific act and the average percent of respondents surveyed for this study in 1962, 1963, and 1964, who define a similar act as not cheating.

---

[24] Bowers, op. cit., p. 47.

Table 34 Percent Of Students Admitting Committing A Specific Act And Average Percent Of Students Defining A Comparable Act As One Which Is Not Cheating

Bowers' Study	% Committing	Rank	This Study	Average % Defining as Not Cheating	Rank
Getting questions or answers from someone who has already taken the same exam	33.00	1	Asking another person, outside of class, what was included on an exam	52.00	1
Giving answers to other students during an exam	17.00	2	Giving another person an answer to a test question, but not asking for one	21.33	2
Copying from someone's test or exam without his knowing about it	16.00	3	Copying answers from another person's exam	.67	4
Having another student take an exam for you	.22	4	Having a friend take a final for you	1.33	3

Though this is a very limited comparison, it does suggest that students are more likely to engage in behavior which they define as not cheating. Further evidence of the relationship between perceptions of cheating and actual cheating behavior is found in a number of recent studies which have compared the incidence of male and female cheating as indicated by self-reports of cheating. These studies indicated a regular pattern of a higher incidence of cheating among males than females.[25] This is in agreement with the finding of this study that males are more likely than females to define a particular behavioral situation as not cheating.

---

[25] Examples are: Russell Middleton and Snell Putney, "Religion, Normative Standards, and Behavior," Sociometry, 25 (June, 1962), pp. 144-145; William J. Bowers, op. cit., p. 207; Charles M. Bonjeau and Reece McGee, "Scholastic Dishonesty Among Undergraduates In Differing Systems of Social Control," Sociology of Education, 38 (Winter 1965), p. 132.

VI. CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

The conclusions of this study and the implications stemming from these are presented below in terms of their relationship to the hypotheses developed in the statement of the theoretical perspective. Hypotheses are presented in order, it is noted whether the analysis of data does or does not support the hypothesis, and in each case possible interpretations and implications are presented.

Hypothesis I

For the majority of situations described by questionnaire items students will demonstrate a high degree of consensus in their designation of these situations as cheating.

Conclusion from data analysis: hypothesis is supported.

Discussion

Of course it is difficult to know the extent to which the situations described by the questionnaire items used in this study are representative of all situations which students might consider a violation of the norm of academic honesty. However, it is clearly evident that of the situations described, the majority are considered by a majority of students as representing a violation of the norm of academic honesty. It may be that further research will reveal a number of additional situations which most students will not consider to be cheating. If this is so, it can be expected that those categories of students in this study who designated low consensus situations as not cheating will tend to designate these additional situations as not cheating. In other words, the position taken here is that the most meaningful test of attitude toward the norm of academic honesty is a test of the definition of low consensus, or ambiguous, situations. Thus, the main analysis in this study has focused on such situations and it is posited that these are the situations which should be emphasised in any pragmatic attempt to deal with the problem of cheating.

Hypothesis II

The relative degree of consensus for the various situations described by questionnaire items will be highly consistent for successive selected sets of students.

Conclusion from data analysis: hypothesis is supported.

Discussion

The high intercorrelation of ranks of items for successive sets of students provides strong support for this hypothesis. This suggests that students are regularly exposed to, or involved in, such situations and that they have had to develop definitions of these situations in terms of the norm of academic honesty. In effect, it appears that definitions of the situation of cheating are a definite and stable element of the university student subculture.

Hypothesis III

Students' perceptions of cheating are indicative of a stable unidimensional attitude toward cheating.

Conclusion from data analysis: hypothesis is supported.

Discussion

Scale analysis and intercorrelations among ranks of scale items provide clear and strong support for this hypothesis. This suggests that individual students develop a definite attitude toward cheating per. se. in the course of their educational experience. This means that perceptions of cheating, as interpreted for this study, may be investigated with more efficient and parsimonious techniques than those used in previous research.

Hypothesis IV

Students who are socially isolated from faculty members will consider more situations as not cheating than those who are not isolated from faculty members.

Conclusion from data analysis: hypothesis is supported.

Discussion

The data provide clear and consistent evidence of the effect of perceived isolation from teachers, as specified for this study, upon students' perceptions of cheating. This effect appears to be stronger for male students than for female students. This implies that successful efforts to modify students' perceptions of teachers' willingness to relate to them will also bring about a modification of students' interpretations of the norm of academic honesty. Such efforts should be particularly fruitful among male students.

Hypothesis V

Students who are socially isolated from other students will consider fewer situations as not cheating than those who are not isolated from other students.

Conclusion from data analysis: hypothesis is not supported.

Discussion

Perceived isolation from other students as specified for this study, does not appear to have a consistent and clear effect upon perceptions of cheating. Thus, it appears that the teacher has a greater influence than other students upon students' interpretations of the content of the norm of academic honesty.

Hypothesis VI

The sex of students is associated with their perceived isolation from teachers.

Conclusion from data analysis: hypothesis is supported.

Discussion

Though their does appear to be a relationship between sex of respondent and perceived isolation from teachers this does not appear to be a marked, nor clear and consistent relationship. The data suggest that males may be more isolated from teachers than females, but any more definite conclusions in this area will require further research.

Hypothesis VII

The sex of students is associated with their perceived isolation from other students.

Conclusion from data analysis: evidence is inconclusive.

Discussion

The support for this hypothesis is neither strong nor consistent and would require more extensive research. Since isolation from students was not clearly related to perceptions of cheating the investigation of student isolation was not pertinent to the study and therefore was limited.

Hypothesis VIII

The sex of students is associated with their perceptions of cheating.

Conclusion from data analysis: hypothesis is supported.

Discussion

There is evidence of a marked and consistent relationship between sex of student and perceptions of cheating. Males consistently define more situations as not cheating than do females. This implies that any efforts aimed at modifying students' interpretations of the norm of academic honesty should be particularly concerned with male students. It can be expected that problems in interpretation of this norm would occur more frequently among male students than among female students.

The last three hypotheses are presented together since none of them receive support from the analysis of data.

Hypothesis IX

Students' class in the university is associated with their perceived isolation from teachers.

Conclusion from data analysis: hypothesis is not supported.

Hypothesis X

Students' class in the university is associated with their perceived isolation from other students.

Conclusion from data analysis: hypothesis is not supported.

Hypothesis XI

Students' class in the university is associated with their perceptions of cheating.

Conclusions from data analysis: hypothesis is not supported.

Discussion

A students' class in the university may be interpreted as indicative of his position in the social structure in the university, or, as indicative of the amount of time he has spent within the social system of the university. In either case, a respondents'class does not seem to have a marked and consistent effect upon perceived isolation nor perceptions of cheating. This implies that sex of student and students' perceived isolation from teachers provide the significant influences upon the students'interpretation of the content of the norm of academic honesty, irrespective of his class in the university. Thus, these influences should hold for all students.

Summary

The evidence from this investigation indicates that among university students there are stable perceptions of the relative degree to which various behaviors constitute violations of the norm of academic honesty, i.e. cheating. These perceptions are consistently related to the sex of the student and students' perceptions of the willingness of teachers to relate to them in a variety of ways. Male students who perceive of teachers as unwilling to relate to them are most likely to define a problematic behavior situation as one which does not constitute cheating. It would appear that this category of students should be of central concern to any program dealing with the problem of cheating in the university.

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE

All responses are handled anonymously so please

do not write your name on the questionnaire.

Student Orientation Survey

(David M. Lewis, 1964)

PLEASE FILL IN OR CHECK THE APPROPRIATE BLANKS

What is your:

Age ____________ Sex: M _____ F _____

Class: Fr _____ Soph _____ Jun _____ Sen _____

Approximate grade point average ____________

Major Area of Study: ____________

Marital Status: Married _____ Single _____

If you are married, what is your spouse's occupation: ____________

What is your father's occupation: ____________

During the time you have been attending Western Michigan University, about how many times have you discussed personal or academic concerns with a teacher:

None _____ 1 _____ 2 _____ 3 or more _____

Which of the following do you consider to be cheating? If you think the behavior described by a statement constitutes cheating, circle the "C" in front of the statement. If you do not consider it as cheating, circle the "NC".

C NC 1. Obtaining answers to test questions before a test is given and memorizing them.

C NC 2. Asking another person, outside of class, what was included on an exam.

C NC 3. Knowingly letting another person copy from your exam.

C NC 4. Copying answers from another person's exam.

C NC 5. Copying from a friend's exam.

C NC 6. Having a friend take a final exam for you.

C NC 7. Giving another person an answer to a test question, but not asking for one.

C NC 8. Obtaining answers to a test that you consider to be unfair.

C NC 9. Obtaining answers to a test when you consider the teacher to be unfair.

C NC 10. Obtaining answers to a test when you think it will be difficult.

C NC 11. Obtaining answers to a test question from another person when other persons around you in class are doing it.

C NC 12. Obtaining answers to a previous exam when the instructor uses the same exam every year and returns them to the student.

C NC 13. Obtaining answers to a previous exam when the instructor uses the same exam every year but does not return them to the student.

C NC 14. Copying the answer to a test question when you know it but can't recall it at the time.

C NC 15. Obtaining answers to a test when you know that others are, and you are being graded on a curve.

C NC 16. Obtaining answers to a test when you don't have time to study.

C NC 17. Looking at notes you have brought to class during an examination.

C NC 18. Looking at notes during an exam to remind you of an answer you have temporarily forgotten.

C NC 19. Copying from another person's exam when you need a good grade in the course in order to graduate.

C NC 20. Having a friend write a class paper for you.

C NC 21. Turning in the same paper to instructors in two different courses.

You may agree with some or all of the statements given below, or you may disagree with some or all of these statements. If you agree with a statement, circle the "A" in front of the statement. If you disagree with a statement, circle the "D".

A D 1. Most students don't really care what happens to other students.

A D 2. If a student can't get good grades it's his own fault.

A D 3. In spite of all the current talk about the importance of education the general situation of the average student is getting worse, not better.

A D 4. With a little luck, any student can get good grades.

A D 5. Today a student has to live pretty much for today and let tomorrow take care of itself.

A D 6. There is no sense in working hard for grades because grades are mostly a matter of chance

A D 7. These days a student doesn't really know whom he can count on.

A D 8. There is no sense in working too hard for grades because most teachers grade on the curve.

A D 9. There is little use in a student asking teachers for help because they aren't really interested in the problems of the average student.

A D 10. A student can get any grade he wants if he is willing to work for it.

Listed below are a number of ways in which a teacher might indicate his recognition of a student or students in his class. Please answer the questions in terms of your general impression of university teachers.

Most Teachers:

Yes No 1. Learn the names of their students.
Yes No 2. Encourage students to talk with them.
Yes No 3. Like to drink coffee with their students at the Student Center.
Yes No 4. Are willing to discuss students' marks with them.
Yes No 5. Recognize and greet students outside of class.
Yes No 6. Respect the opinions of students in Class.
Yes No 7. Are as friendly with students as with other teachers.
Yes No 8. Are aware of student activities.
Yes No 9. Are willing to listen to students' academic problems.
Yes No 10. Are willing to listen to students' personal problems.

Listed below are a number of ways in which a student might indicate that he recognizes another student or students in his classes. Please answer the questions in terms of your general impression of other university students.

Most Students:

Yes No 1. Will help other students with their homework.

Yes No 2. Like to drink coffee with other students at the Student Center.

Yes No 3. Help get dates for other students.

Yes No 4. Will introduce you to students you don't know.

Yes No 5. Are willing to listen to other students' academic problems.

Yes No 6. Are willing to listen to other students' personal problems.

Yes No 7. Will share class notes with other students.

Yes No 8. Are willing to study together with other students.

Yes No 9. Are willing to talk over tests and assignments.

Yes No 10. Will pick up other students who are hitchiking.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anderson, W. F. Jr., "Attitudes of University Students Toward Cheating," Journal of Educational Research, 50 (April 1957), 581-588.

Benjamin, A. C., "Ethics of Scholorship," Journal of Higher Education, 31 (December 1960), 471-480.

Blalock, Hubert M. Jr., Social Statistics, (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960).

Blumer, Herbert, "An Appraisal of Thomas and Znaniecki's "The Polish Peasant in Europe and America," Social Science Research Bulletin No. 44, (New York: Social Science Research Council, 1939).

Bonjeou, Charles M. and McGee, Reese, "Scholastic Dishonesty Among Undergraduates In Differing Systems Of Social Control," Sociology of Education, 38 (Winter 1965), pp. 127-137.

Bowers, William J., Student Dishonesty and Its Control in College, (New York: Bureau of Applied Social Research, Columbia University, 1964).

Burton, Roger V., "Generality of Honesty Reconsidered," Psychological Review, 70 (Nov. 1963), 481-499.

Carlson, Earl R. and Rae Carlson, "Male and Female Subjects In Personality Research," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 61 (No. 3, 1960), 482-483.

Clinard, Marshall B. (ed.), Anomie and Deviant Behavior, (New York: Macmillan, 1964).

Cloward, Richard A., "Illegitimate Means, Anomie, and Deviant Behavior," *American Sociological Review*, *24* (April 1959), 164-176.

Coser, Lewis A. and B. Rosenberg, Sociological Theory: A Book of Readings, (New York: Macmillan, 1964).

Dean, Dwight D., "Alienation: Its Meaning and Measurement," American Sociological Review, 26 (October 1961), 753-758.

Drake, Charles A., "Why Students Cheat," Journal of Higher Education, 20 (November 1941), 418-420.

Edwards, Allen L., Techniques of Attitude Scale Construction, (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1957).

Faculty Senate of Western Michigan University, University Policies and the Faculty, (Kalamazoo, Michigan: Western Michigan University, rev. ed., 1965).

Frymier, J. R., "Faculty and Student Perceptions of Cheating," Journal of Educational Research, 54 (November 1960), 118-120.

Gibbs, Jack P., "Norms: The Problem of Definition and Classification," American Journal of Sociology, 70 (March 1965), 586-594.

Guttman, Louis, "On Festinger's Evaluation of Scale Analysis," Psychological Bulletin, 44 (Sept. 1947), 451-465.

Henricks, M. L., "Changing Mores Concerning Cheating on Examinations," School and Society, 86 (November 1958) 413-414.

Hojda, Jan, "Alienation and Integration of Student Intellectuals," American Sociological Review, 26 (October 1961), 758-777.

Johnson, Harry M., Sociology: A Systematic Introduction, (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1960).

Menzel, Herbert, "A New Coefficient for Scalogram Analysis," Public Opinion Quarterly, 17 (Summer, 1953), 268-80.

Merton, Robert K., "Social Conformity, Deviation, and Opportunity-Structures: A Comment on the Contributions of Dubin and Cloward," American Sociological Review, 24 (April 1959), 177-189.

Middleton, Russell and Snell, Putney, "Religion, Normative Standards, and Behavior," Sociometry, 25 (June 1962), 141-152.

Riley, Matilda W., et. al., Sociological Studies In Scale Analysis, New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 1954).

Srole, Leo, "Social Integration and Certain Corollaries: An Exploratory Study," American Sociological Review, 21 (December 1956), 709-716.

Student Association of Western Michigan University, 1965 Western Way, (Kalamazoo, Michigan: Western Michigan University, 1965).

Thomas, William I., "The Persistence of Primary-group Norms in Present-day Society and Their Influence in Our Educational System," in Herbert S. Jennings et. al. Suggestions of Modern Science Concerning Education, (New York: Macmillan Co., 1917) 159-197.

Thomas, William I., The Unadjusted Girl, (Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1923).

Torgerson, Warren S., Theory and Methods of Scaling, (New York: John Wiley and Sons Inc., 1958).